

### **REMARKS**

Applicant acknowledges the allowance of claims 35 and 45 as well as the allowability of claim 3 if rewritten in independent form. Rather than rewrite claim 3 in independent form, applicant has amended claim 1 to include the limitation of claim 3 of the S-shaped links. Claim 1, and all of the claims dependent from claim 1 are considered to be allowable. Claim 1 has been broadened by deleting the limitation of the arm "lying closely adjacent said arm segment". That limitation is unnecessary to define over Ley in view of the amendment reciting the S-shape of the links.

Claim 2 has been rewritten in independent form. Although it does not include the explicit recitation of the link being S-shaped, it does include the limitation that the arms in said link of adjacent nodes curve in opposite directions. Ley fails to suggest such oppositely curving arms, just as Ley fails to disclose or suggest the use of S-shaped links in the claimed combination.

Claims 23, 36, and 44 have been amended to include the S-shaped configuration of the link.

Reconsideration is requested of the rejection of claim 46 as anticipated by Ley. Claim 46 is directed to an arrangement in which the gap between adjacent arms is of substantially constant width up to the transition region. Ley says nothing about any dimensional characteristic between adjacent arms and makes no suggestion that a substantially constant width gap up to the transition region should be employed or is a desirable feature. The drawings in Ley, such as FIG. 14A, should not be taken as disclosing this feature of applicant's claimed invention. It is well recognized that in the absence of an explicit statement as to the scale and dimensional accuracy of patent drawings, such drawings should not be taken as disclosing a dimensional relationship. Here, only applicant discloses the constant gap limitation (see original claim 8). It would be improper to read Ley in light of applicant's disclosure. A fair reading of Ley, without the benefit of the knowledge of applicant's invention, would not lead one of ordinary skill to conclude that Ley disclosed or suggested applicant's claimed constant width gap.

Ser. No.: 09/603,409


Amdt. dated: March 11, 2004

Reply to Office action of Sept. 11, 2003

Indeed, considering Ley in its entirety, to include other drawings in which the adjacent arms clearly diverge at a wide angle from their central connection point suggests that Ley does not fairly disclose the claimed constant width gap. See, e.g., FIG. 16A, 16B, 20B, 21A, among others.

By the foregoing amendments, all of the elected claims, as amended, are considered to be allowable.

Respectfully submitted,



Arthur Z. Bookstein

Reg. No. 22,958

KIRKPATRICK & LOCKHART LLP

75 State Street

Boston, Massachusetts 02109-1808

Customer No.: 022832

Tel: 617-261-3100

Attorneys for Applicant

Attorney Docket No.: B0762/7001

Date: March 11, 2004